0038336

K-66248
PA 36
9-75

THE PORT AUTHORITY OF NY & NJ

PORT AUTHORITY OF N. Y. & N. J.
RECEIVED
NOV 30 1981
WORLD TRADE DEPARTMENT
DEP. DIR. PHYS. FAC.

To Mr. R. J. Linn Room No 63W

From J. G. Carlock Room No 63E

Date 11 / 25 / 81

Re: WTC - Asbestos

As per our meeting Friday, November 20th, I contacted General Motors and attached is a report of the results.

/gem

Jim

cc: Messrs. D. Censullo, F. DiPaolo, L. Feld - all w/att

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT PX-654

On Monday November 23rd, I called Jerry Hopko of General Motors, who administered their sprinkler retrofitting project over an approximate 6-year period. They permitted tenants to do their own work if they were new tenants or existing tenants with plans to renovate their premises.

The balance of the space was sprinklered under a Contract between General Motors and a contractor (S & S Sprinklers) and all the work was provided during the day except in executive suites. The tenants had no objection to the day work and General Motors considered nighttime security problems far worse than daytime interference with General Motors or tenant staff operations.

All fireproofing in this structure contains asbestos and was not "oversprayed" with a sealer. Nevertheless, there are no specific provisions in any of their contracts which require special precautions on the part of the contractor and his workmen. Only a general provision is included that the Contractor shall comply with all municipal, state and federal regulations, codes and statutes. Mr. Hopko apprised me that he did not point out that asbestos is present in the fireproofing, but he "told them if they asked".

The sprinkler contractor was aware of the presence of asbestos and took no unusual precautions. However, during the work, an employee of one tenant complained to OSHA, who sent an inspector (name unknown). The inspector provided detectors to be worn by the workman AND concluded from this test that the fiber content was within acceptable limits and that the complaint was not justified.

The OSHA inspector acknowledged she could not check other floors in the building without other complaints, but eventually did so with the consent of General Motors management and concluded that there was no problem in other areas. However, she recommended that the workmen wear "standard" masks. Mr. Hopko indicated that they used ordinary dust masks, but not all the time.

There were no further incidents of the above for the rest of the job.

When we (J. Carlock, P. Goz, D. Bais and J. Schwartz) visited Mr. Hopko last May 1981, we toured a construction site with contractor workers present, but otherwise unoccupied. Much of the ceiling was open, the fireproofing looked friable but I do not recall anyone with masks (including the tour group), nor did I observe any special precautions being xxxxx taken.

JGC/gem

11/24/81